

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Wilska et al. (UK 2,289,555) in view of Takahara et al. (U.S. 5,436,635). The rejections are traversed.

The applicants claim a docking system for a portable handheld wireless telephone. That docking system includes a "port" that couples the handheld wireless telephone housing with the docking system housing. No such limitations are disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Wilska discusses a laptop computer. That computer includes **integrated** electronics for providing wireless cellular telephone service. Wilska does not disclose or suggest a docking system. The Wilska device is not configured to mount a handheld wireless telephone as claimed.

Takahara is cited only for its discussion of display devices. Takahara does not cure the deficiencies of Wilska.

The Office Action, however, jumps to the conclusion that a radio-telephone may be externally attached to the notebook computer of Wilska. No such suggestion or motivation is provided by Wilska. At best Wilska discusses a PCMCIA radio. That is far from a portable wireless telephone, which includes a microphone, a speaker, and transceiver circuitry.

A portable wireless telephone (or any telephone) could be coupled to a laptop computer by an interface cable. But that does not suggest that the laptop computer has a specific port for receiving a specific wireless telephone housing, as recited in the claims.

The independent claims have been amended to clarify the telephone limitation and should now be allowable over the cited references. Allowance of the dependent claims follow from the allowance of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims recite additional patentable subject matter. All claims should now be allowable over the prior art.

Claims 1-25 and 27-29 also stand provisionally rejected based on obviousness-type double patenting. The Applicants wish to put that rejection into abeyance until all claims have been otherwise allowed.

Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By  _____

Rodney D. Johnson

Registration No. 36,558

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

February 11, 2007